

The Republican.

No. 9. Vol. I.] LONDON, FRIDAY, Oct. 22, 1819. [PRICE, 2d.

A LETTER TO SIR CHARLES ABBOTT, KNT.

Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench,

On his conduct in that Court on the 13th, 14th, and 15th days of October instant.

King's Bench Prison, Oct. 20, 1819.

My Lord,

I PRESUME that each of us in a less disturbed moment are better prepared to re-argue and re-consider the proceedings of that court in which you preside, and which you converted from a Court of Justice to a Court of Inquisition, during that mockery of justice and of trial, in which you, my Lord, in concert with the Law-Officers of the Crown, and a predetermined Jury, conspired to deny me a defence or justification of my conduct and motives. Considering the Court in the character of a Holy Inquisition, not in its literal acceptation, which means only to inquire into and to examine, but in its common acceptation, such as we speak and think of that in Spain, I shall proceed to inquire,

1st. Whether your conduct was the result of a belief that the book you so pertinaciously held under your robe was of a sacred character?

2dly. Whether you were not the political instrument, used against your will, for the protection of the clergy and the 6,000,000£ per annum they draw from the pockets of the People; as a necessary influence and a wicked instrument in the hands of a corrupt Government?

3dly. Whether the interests of mankind will be protected by protecting the alleged sacred character of that book?

4thly. Which of us had the best of the argument on the point of law relative to the book called the Holy Bible, and the Christian religion?

And lastly, What will be the ultimate effect of the dis-

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

cussion on those subjects raised by the *Attorney-General* and the *Vice Society*, with their *legal debauchee*?*

In answer to the first inquiry, whether your conduct was the result of a belief that the book you so pertinaciously held under your robe was of a sacred character, I would observe, that before you had attempted to have taken that book under your protection, you should have asked yourself the following questions: "Will my shielding (by the authority I hold in this court) this book from examination be received as a proof of its sacred character, or excite doubts that would otherwise never have existed? Will the resistance to every effort of the Defendant to examine it after he has publicly denounced it a falsehood, and expressed his conviction that he had no other defence of his good intention than to shew the truth and moral tendency of his own publication, by exposing the falsehood and immoral tendency of that to which it was opposed, and of which it professed to be an investigation, add to or remove those doubts? Will my expressing a firm belief in this book as a divine revelation be believed, when I display a fear to allow even a humble bookseller to examine it in justification of his attack upon it as an immoral work?" Truth, my Lord, is very simple, and is most frequently found in men of simple and uneducated minds. There is but one axiom on which truth can be placed, and on that I rested my whole defence, which alarmed your Lordship and your yelping bantlings, the Law-Officers of the Crown, and called forth from your united efforts, aided by the predetermination of the Jury, an interposition which denied me a defence. The axiom I allude to is this—that there is but one mode of defending the truth, which is by shewing that that which it is opposed to, is falsehood. This, my Lord, you are well aware was the mode of defence I had taken, you had time to deliberate and to reflect on the force and validity of this defence, and the charge that I made against you in the court, and which I am now bold to repeat after the most mature deliberation, namely, that a concert had been entered into after the first adjournment of the Court before it again resumed its sitting, to use every effort to coun-

* The open profligacy and debauchery of this man is such, that with a knowledge of his possessing more abilities than any of those now on the bench, our *virtuous ministers* have been ashamed to elevate him to that situation. We know their scruples are not trifling!!!

teract or finally to determine not to hear that mode of defence. This, my Lord, was your reason for shielding the book as a sacred book—the same motive has hitherto actuated the Brahmins of India to protect and shelter their Veda—the priests of Heliopolis their rites and mysteries—the Persians their Zendavesta—the Mufti their Koran—and the Jews and Christians the books called the Old and New Testament. The very reflection that this pretended word of the JUDGE OF ALL THINGS should require the protection of a human judge in a Court of Law, will make more infidels to your sacred book than the most severe and rigorous examination I could have given it, and the most wanton attack that could possibly be made upon it. If that "firm belief" your Lordship avowed had been in that book as a divine revelation, you would have gained credit for that assertion, by holding it up to my examination or any other person's examination. If I could avow a firm belief in that book as a divine revelation, I would challenge the Age of Reason, The Principles of Nature, or any other book to investigate it, and attack it in any shape whatever. The fear you have displayed, my Lord, is a proof not of your "firm belief" in it as divine, but of your hypocrisy in pretending to believe that which your better judgment and private knowledge condemns. But if your Lordship be sufficiently weak in mind and intellect really to believe, I would refer you to the following chapters: Genesis xiv. xviii. xix. xxx. xxxiv. xxxv. xxxviii. and xxxix., Leviticus xv., Numbers xxv., Deuteronomy xxii. and xxiii., Judges xvi. and xix., 1 Samuel xxv., 2 Samuel xi. xiii. and xiv., The Song of Solomon i. to viii., Ezekiel iv. xiv. xxii. and xxiii., Hosea i. ii. and iii., Epistle of Paul to the Romans, chap. i. verses 25, 26, 27 and 28. Read these chapters, my Lord, before you come into Court to make any observation on the propriety of setting aside or confirming the verdict, you have so dishonestly and disreputably obtained against me: ask yourself whether the book that contains such Chapters as these, is a fit book to put into the hands of your children, or your domestics, or even into the hands of your Lady.

I think, my Lord, I have sufficiently shewn that your pertinacity did not proceed from a veneration of the book, but from a sense of its falsehood and a dread of its exposure; not that you as an individual could have been injured by that exposure, but from the fear that the false and corrupt system to which you have sworn attachment, and from which you have never deviat-

180 to show that the **THE REPUBLICAN** of yester
yesterday not posses moy env bout you sidT son
cussion on those subjects raised by the Attorney-General
and the Vice Society, with their *legal debauchee*?*

In answer to the first inquiry, whether your conduct was the result of a belief that the book you so pertinaciously held under your robe was of a sacred character, I would observe, that before you had attempted to have taken that book under your protection, you should have asked yourself the following questions: "Will my shielding (by the authority I hold in this court) this book from examination be received as a proof of its sacred character, or excite doubts that would otherwise never have existed? Will the resistance to every effort of the Defendant to examine it after he has publicly denounced it a falsehood, and expressed his conviction that he had no other defence of his good intention than to shew the truth and moral tendency of his own publication, by exposing the falsehood and immoral tendency of that to which it was opposed, and of which, it professed to be an investigation, add to or remove those doubts? Will my expressing a firm belief in this book as a divine revelation be believed, when I display a fear to allow even a humble bookseller to examine it in justification of his attack upon it as an immoral work?" Truth, my Lord, is very simple, and is most frequently found in men of simple and uneducated minds. There is but one axiom on which truth can be placed, and on that I rested my whole defence, which alarmed your Lordship and your yelping hauflings, the Law-Officers of the Crown, and called forth from your united efforts, aided by the predetermination of the Jury, an interposition which denied me a defence. The axiom I allude to is this—that there is but one mode of defending the truth, which is by shewing that that which it is opposed to, is falsehood. This, my Lord, you are well aware was the mode of defence I had taken, you had time to deliberate and to reflect on the force and validity of this defence, and the charge that I made against you in the Court, and which I am now bold to repeat after the most mature deliberation, namely, that a concert had been entered into after the first adjournment of the Court before it again resumed its sitting, to use every effort to coun-

* The open profligacy and debauchery of this man is such, that with a knowledge of his possessing more abilities than any of those now on the bench, our *virtuous ministers* have been ashamed to elevate him to that situation. We know their scruples are not trifling!!!

teract or finally to determine not to hear that mode of defence. This, my Lord, was your reason for shielding the book as a sacred book—the same motive has hitherto actuated the Brahmins of India to protect and shelter their Veda—the priests of Heliopolis their rites and mysteries—the Persians their Zendavesta—the Mufti their Koran—and the Jews and Christians the books called the Old and New Testament. The very reflection that this pretended word of the **JUDGE OF ALL THINGS** should require the protection of a human judge in a Court of Law, will make more infidels to your sacred book than the most severe and rigorous examination I could have given it, and the most wanton attack that could possibly be made upon it. If that "firm belief" your Lordship avowed had been in that book as a divine revelation, you would have gained credit for that assertion, by holding it up to my examination or any other person's examination. If I could avow a firm belief in that book as a divine revelation, I would challenge the Age of Reason, The Principles of Nature, or any other book to investigate it, and attack it in any shape whatever. The fear you have displayed, my Lord, is a proof not of your "firm belief" in it as divine, but of your hypocrisy in pretending to believe that which your better judgment and private knowledge condemns. But if your Lordship be sufficiently weak in mind and intellect really to believe, I would refer you to the following chapters: Genesis xiv. xviii. xix. xxx. xxxiv. xxxv. xxxviii. and xxxxix., Leviticus xv., Numbers xxv., Deuteronomy xxii. and xxiii., Judges xvi. and xix., 1 Samuel xxv., 2 Samuel xi. xiii. and xiv., The Song of Solomon i. to viii., Ezekiel iv. xiv. xxii. and xxiii., Hosea i. ii. and iii., Epistle of Paul to the Romans, chap. i. verses 25, 26, 27 and 28. Read these chapters, my Lord, before you come into Court to make any observation on the propriety of setting aside or confirming the verdict, you have so dishonestly and disreputably obtained against me: ask yourself whether the book that contains such Chapters as these, is a fit book to put into the hands of your children, or your domestics, or even into the hands of your Lady.

I think, my Lord, I have sufficiently shewn that your pertinacity did not proceed from a veneration of the book, but from a sense of its falsehood and a dread of its exposure; not that you as an individual could have been injured by that exposure, but from the fear that the false and corrupt system to which you have sworn attachment, and from which you have never deviated.

ed, would, by a general knowledge of the origin and character of that book, speedily fall to the ground. I shall now proceed to the second enquiry,—whether you were not the political instrument, used against your will, for the protection of the Clergy, and the six millions *per annum* they draw from the pockets of the people, as a necessary influence, and a wicked instrument in the hands of a corrupt Government.

That you were the political instrument, I venture to assert from the knowledge, that you have invariably opposed its being brought into the Court of King's Bench for decision, from the commencement of the business of filing the Information down to the time of the *mock trial*. I am aware, that you actually maintained your objections in a correspondence with Lord Castlereagh in the spring of the present year. However, convinced as you might have been of the rotten ground on which my prosecutors stood, if the question had been fairly argued, and if there had been a *trial*, which I contend there has not been, you were at length compelled to give way, as the general knowledge which the Theological Writings of Mr. Paine had diffused of the fabulous nature of that book, which has so long been held sacred, and which has so long served the purposes of the Clergy in draining the produce arising from the industry of the labourer, was calculated to overwhelm in a short time all the clamours of the interested Clergy, and to have produced a general contempt and derision towards any individual, that should have been hardy enough to have stood up, and to have spoken in the name of the Deity, promising rewards or punishments to those who should accede to or decline from his instructions. You, my Lord, need not be told that the Clergy are a strong though a corrupt prop to the present system of Government, neither need you be told, that if that prop be taken away the Government would not exist in its present corrupt and wicked state three months without the aid of the Clergy. Religion was not the object for protection, the thing is laughed at among the higher circle of society, and those who make a show of respect towards it consider it necessary only as an example to those whom they think are looking up to them for precept. It is for this reason that we hear that the Regent attended such and such a place of worship, or that prayers were read at home by some Chaplain or his favourite, the "Dandy Bishop." We, the people of England, all know that the Regent would rather spend an hour over his bottle, or with his favourite

less, than be exposed to the dull ceremony of a continual repetition of the same prayers. It is for just the same reason that your Lordship and your brother Judges go on the first Sunday of every Term to St. Paul's Church, and afterwards to a banquet with the Lord Mayor. I will pledge myself that the reflection produced by the sermon of the Lord Mayor's Chaplain is soon exploded by the viands and wine put on his Lordship's table. It is the outward show only that is considered necessary to be observed, but, my Lord, those classes of society to whom you would wish those examples to be made, are no longer to be duped by such shallow artifices; they have read and judged for themselves, and when they find that the book on which your supposed faith is established is not to be pried into, they will think with a late Archbishop of Canterbury (Tillotson) "that if it is too good to be examined, it is too bad to be believed." I trust that I have here made it appear, that it is the weighty influence the Government hold with an established clergy that has called forth this persecution against the Age of Reason, and not from any respect or reverence for religion considered in the abstract.

I shall now proceed with the third query. Whether the interest of mankind will be frustrated by protecting the alleged sacred character of that book? This may be answered in a few words, on the ground, that truth needs neither the flowers of eloquence nor the blandishments of art for its advocate. Many men with weak minds and good hearts have, I believe, been sincere when they have asserted, that it is necessary to keep up some pious fraud. But I would say, "Why is it necessary?" It can produce no other effect than to keep the minds of those who have some little belief in these "pious frauds" in continual doubt; it puts the mind of man, as it were, under the effects of a disease; it is never healthful, it is at one time in the heat of fever or phrenzy, at another chilled with cold despair. Truth only can give health to the mind of man; truth only can give it serenity; the real interests of mankind cannot be founded on any other basis than truth. It is by mysterious books and mysterious doctrines that mankind have been kept in that distracted and unnatural state, from the present time up to the earliest period in history. I trust, my Lord, that the time is near at hand, when they will throw aside mysterious and unintelligible books, or books not fit to be examined, and take their lessons from Nature only. The fourth question is with regard to the law of the case.

Your Lordship insisted by assertion only, and not by argument, that Christianity was part and parcel of the law of the land, meaning the common law. I replied, that if it ever was part of the common law, it had been superseded by the statute law, and the only answer to my reply was, "I do not sit here to answer particular questions"—"the Court cannot be replied to"—or, "I have already given my opinion." I shall first inquire on what ground your assertion rests, that Christianity is part of the common law. Whether that which is called common law did not exist—before Christianity existed in this country. I am not aware exactly at what period the person called St. Austin preached under the oak to the Saxon King and Queen, having no book of reference to the date by me, but this I know that the vague thing called the constitution in this country, is alledged to have had its origin prior to that date, and consequently the religion which existed in the country prior to the arrival of Christianity must then have been part of the common law of the land, and Christianity itself became an innovation on that part of the common law. This, my Lord, as the Attorney-General would say, is taking up your own mode of argument, and now where are you my Lord? The first praying from the bench about Christianity being part and parcel of the law of the land, was by Sir Matthew Hale about 150 years since, whereas Christianity has been known in this country above a 1000. If your Lordship will give this a thought again, you will find it a specious mode of reasoning, for a dictum will not do for the present age, at least it disgraces the judicial character to make an assertion that no one believes. Sir Matthew Hale thought that he was administering the law of the land, when he caused the poor old woman to be burnt as a witch, as much as when he asserted that Christianity was a part of that law: his ideas were as valid and as worthy of respect in one instance as in the other. Christianity and witchcraft have the same origin and about the same foundation, and your Lordship should not protect the one and discard the other. I hesitate not to assert that if your Lordship cannot find better argument to support in the next term the common law part of this case, you will lose your character as an honest judge and lawyer. With respect to the statute law, I take the 53 of George the Third as my shield, and the argument and assertion I have used is such that your Lordship and the Attorney-General could not meet on fair and rational ground. When your Lordship repeated that Christianity was the law of the land, I asked

whether you meant Christianity independent of the Trinity? "The Court cannot answer questions." We shall hear by and bye that the Court like the Pope is infallible. That its infallibility is part of the law of the land. That to doubt it will be an offence against the laws, and merits punishment. I insist that the statute allows the impugning of Christianity, which means to embattle, to attack, to destroy Christianity if you can by argument; because if you take away the Trinity, which is admitted even by Christians to be the only sacred part of it, you leave it a system to be followed at the pleasure of man similar to that of Confucius or Zoroaster. Should it be necessary, it is my determination to carry this point of law, to our noble and hereditary legislators.

The effect of the discussion that has been raised on this subject, I am sure, will be ultimately conducive to the interests and welfare of mankind. Truth solicits exposure, falsehood dreads it. Ridley and Latimer said, when at the stake, that they should that day kindle a blaze that would never be extinguished; their assertion proved true, as it was applicable only to the Protestant interest as opposed to the Catholic. Your Lordship, with the Law-Officers of the Crown, and the Vice Society, with their legal debauchee, have kindled a flame that will never be extinguished, by your endeavour to crush by the most foul and illegal means.

Yours until the next Term,

RICHARD CARLILE.

R. Carlile begs to inform his friends the Deists of the metropolis, that he is now confined in the King's Bench Prison for the want of three persons as bail, one in £400. and two in £200; one in £400. being ready. He hopes that the cause of Deism will not long remain under this stigma. As the enemies of Deism, the supporters of falsehood and superstition no doubt flatter themselves that they have crushed it by confining its humble though most forward advocate, R. Carlile solicits from the public the names of those who are willing to have them published in approbation of his conduct: as he flatters himself that the open avowal of sentiment is at this moment of the utmost importance, he will publish them from time to time. A subscription is not the object so much as the real name and address of the party subscribing. The name without money will be as thankfully received as the name with money. R. C. has the pleasure to say, that the manner in which a

gentleman has expressed his feelings on the occasion, has been a consolation that far exceeds any pain that the most tedious imprisonment would occasion. Agreeable to the request of the gentleman, his name and address is inserted.

Alexander and Jane Morrison, 5, Duke's Row,
Tavistock Square £10 10 0
Antichristian 5 0 0

TO THE READERS OF THE REPUBLICAN.

The mock Trials of Mr. Carlile will be published in sheets, at two-pence each; it will be a complete report of the proceedings of the 4 days, and will comprise near 40 sheets. The first sheet is ready for delivery; the publication will proceed as rapidly as possible. A sheet containing title page and prefatory matter, will be published as early as possible.

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

My gratitude, for the *real* and *lasting* benefits I have received through your meritorious exertions, as a publisher, impels me to communicate my sentiments to you. It is not myself, that I supremely love, but it is the God of nature, my country, and my country's friends.

I am ready and willing to exercise every faculty of my mind, for the good of the People; and if necessary, I will use all my physical powers, and even bleed, and die for the cause of liberty. That man does not deserve to enjoy freedom, who will not struggle, nor make any sacrifice to obtain it.

I am sorry to say that my feelings of late, have been severely wounded by hearing a person possessing unbounded patriotism, and such a superior mind as *you* most unquestionably do; and it must be extremely painful for every reasonable and honest person, to hear such a valuable character defamed, and called an "audacious villain;" but this is the way your name is made use of in this dark, superstitious, and stupidly slavish part of the country. The only reason (when I ask) these stupid and ungrateful beings, can assign for their base conduct towards you, is your having had the praiseworthy boldness to write letters to the Prince Regent, and told him with manly freedom, his faults, and what is the duty of

a Prince. The whole nation has had but too good a proof that he stood in great need of *your remonstrance and instruction*. I leave it to the honest and wise part of the community, to determine whether the term "audacious villain," may not be more justly applied to the Prince himself than to you. For has he not publicly and unfeelingly returned his thanks (such as they are) to a brutal set of cowardly murderers, contrary to the feelings and requests of nine-tenths of his subjects, and thereby incurred their just indignation?

Now is it possible that any rational being can consider such short-sighted, vile, and inhuman conduct becoming or admissible in a Prince?

Before we can reasonably affix a notion of value to any thing, or our interests and affections can justly be engaged by any person, we must necessarily be sensible of such thing or person, possessing some degree of excellence, or superiority, worthy of our esteem or affections. It is to every British subject a question of great importance (though not difficult of solution,) whether the Prince Regent, or any part of the family, the Duke of Sussex excepted, ever merited the affections of the People of this country. On the other hand admitting that he were ever so good, and worthy the esteem of every human-being, what need could there be for him, or what service could or would he render the country as a king; for kings are useless, though dreadfully expensive beings to any country, and particularly so to this; and there should not exist any such thing as king in an *enlightened nation*.

No hereditary power, honour, right, or title, can possibly be consistent with nature and strict justice. It is contrary to all reason and justice, that a son or any branch of a family should have the honour or emolument continued to them, that were merited and received by the father, for the good he had rendered his country. Every person has a natural right to be rewarded in proportion to the service he may render his country, but this should not be exceeded.

That detestable and unjust law which gives the oldest son the sole possession of his father's estate, has been the utter ruin of thousands of families, while on the other hand, it has involved a few in unreasonable wealth, and unlimited power; and caused some to live in *splendid depravity*.

It is contrary to equity that there should be any such thing as real property; this has been the ruin of many honest and benevolent tradesmen who have unfortunately been in the habit of giving credit to persons possessing large estates but no personal property.

Every person ought, according to strict justice, to be able to dispose of his own property as he pleases. No son or daughter has any more right to a greater share of the parent's fortune than another, except from virtue and superior merit; and it is unquestionably the duty of every parent who has a fortune to distribute, to attend to, and reward such virtue and merit in due proportion to

their deserts. But I am fearful you will consider me as running too far from the subject with which I commenced this letter. However I think it will serve in some degree to prove the necessity of a change in almost all our present existing laws.

Undue power, priesthood, superstition, and the great and unnatural inequality of mankind, are the principal causes of all the dissatisfaction and misery which now exist in the world. It may be said that there always did exist an inequality among mankind, and it most unquestionably must ever be so, but it should only be an inequality consistent with pure justice, but this kind of inequality at this time is totally unknown; and under the present state of things, virtue and true merit have no reward except that of the individual's conscience.

Look into the established system of religion in this country, do we not there find, that almost all those that rank high in the church (I mean those that have rich livings, and fat benefices given to them,) are men possessing neither virtue, honesty, piety, or abilities; but who are continually feasting themselves upon enormous sums of money extorted from the industrious part of the community; and what is it that these worthless reverends do for all this money? I think it is pretty evident nothing more than preach up those abominable (but which they call glorious) systems of oppression, which have nearly brought the whole nation to destruction; and the church system must be altered before the country can possibly be in a happy or flourishing condition.

Before the People can be blest with, and cordially receive, a perfect Government, and a pure and equitable code of laws, they must reject the Bible as being the word of the true God; and also I totally disbelieve the divinity of Christ. For while they are inflexible in the Christian faith there is no possibility of establishing equitable laws; or even acting in a private way justly towards each other; for by the doctrines of the Bible and New Testament, nature is subverted, and where nature is destroyed no perfection can possibly remain.

I was in my youthful days taught to read the Bible, and I continued to read and reverence it more than twenty years; and was as tenacious of it and the Christian religion as any one could be, except at some few short intervals, when the reason that nature had given me was allowed to act; but priesthood had carefully provided a sufficiently powerful enemy to defeat the efforts of this divine light of nature, until I had the courage to read the "Deist" and Paine's "Age of Reason." And I do most affectionately entreat all my fellow-countrymen to throw far from them that book which scarcely contains any thing but *blasphemy, profaneness, lies, and unequalled absurdities*; and instead of the Bible, I would above all things have them read attentively: the "Age of Reason," and the "Deist," which are books replete with perspicuous truth.

According to the doctrines of the Bible, no crime can be looked

OCTOBER 22, 1819.

139

upon with half the blackness, and horror, that the natural conscience of man describes it. For in that book the most atrocious murders are palliated, and in many instances considered as the very essence of the service of the true God.

It is the Bible and such books that have degraded and made men far worse than the most hateful part of the brute creation.

Far degenerated is that man from the purity of his nature, and bad indeed in heart, who can only be restrained from doing that which is contrary to moral rectitude and justice, but by the fear of a future existence.

Nature has implanted in the human breast the purest principles of virtue and justice; and the tenderest feelings of compassion and love to each other. It has been false systems of religion alone that have caused such degeneracy in the human race; and which now so powerfully militate against the happiness of mankind.

I remain, dear Sir,

Your most sincere well-wisher,

Westgate, Peterborough. J. B. SMITH,

October 10th, 1819.

P. S. On reading over this letter, I am sorry to find that I have not expressed my thoughts in a better manner, but as they came forth, so I wrote them; and as I believe they are all facts, you are at liberty to do just what you please with them. The desire I feel to see my country in freedom and happiness is equal to your own; but I want abilities and language to express my feelings properly. I believe I am the only person in this city, or even neighbourhood, who has boldly and openly spoke in favour of the People, and Reform; and have thereby got the ill-will of hundreds, and many have done me considerable injury in the way of my business, both here and at Stamford. However, if I can by any exertion or sacrifice, render you or my country the least service, I shall consider myself tenfold rewarded for all my pains.

I have hopes, that by the struggle, we may gain a Republican Government, which is the only one that can be considered naturally good and perfect.

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

THE right of free discussion upon *every subject* whatever—or in other words, the right of publishing our opinions upon every matter or occasion, is a subject which has occasionally occupied my attention for now upwards of forty years. Upon this subject I believe there is not much difference in our way of thinking. But I absolutely deny what I think I have seen you admit, that any Jury whatever has a right to take cognizance of, much less to decide upon the rectitude and propriety of *opinions* altogether. A jury may say what *their* opinion is upon any speculative question or subject, though this would be extra-judicial and imperti-

ment: but such opinion, if it did not convince me that my judgment was erroneous, could not be expected to make any change in my views as to such question or subject, and ought not to be followed by any other consequence. The folly and injustice of twelve men deciding on the quality of an opinion upon any subject whatever will be easily illustrated. Suppose an able defence of Christianity was arraigned as a libel, and the author brought before an English jury—he would be soon and honourably acquitted. Let the same defence and the same author be tried by a jury of Mahometans at Constantinople, and he would be punished with death. In like manner, let a Deist or Republican be tried for the publication of his opinions by a jury of twelve priest-ridden and passive-obedience fellows, and what chance would he have of either justice or fair play? In all this sort of cases, if trials must be had, surely the same mode of proceeding should be adopted which is employed in the case of foreigners when accused of and tried for crimes, viz. the jury should be one-half foreigners, Deists, or Republicans, as the case may be. But you may be compelled to go before a jury for the publication of your opinions, and as this will probably be the case soon, I wish very much to assist you in your defence.

In shaping this the most advantageously for you, I will endeavour to submit my notions in the way of aphorisms; and the text, or touch-stone, by which every axiom, whether pro or con, shall be tried, is one which every body admits to be true, and which I never met with one person who had the impudence to deny, viz.

“That as you wish that every one should do unto yourself, so ought you to do unto them.”

Having premised this, I go on to say, that the right of thinking is given by his Maker to every human being, and cannot be taken from him by any power under heaven. But as this right of thinking would be of no value without the right and power of speaking, the two must be considered as forming one right only.

This right must, of course, belong to all human beings equally, for either every man has this right or no man has it. This right, too, is retained, and can never be surrendered, under every form of Government, and under all circumstances in which man can be placed, whether in a state of nature or in a state of society. To suppose the contrary would lead to every thing absurd, an Act of Parliament is passed, which the persons enacting it consider as proper at the time. In a while some of its provisions are felt, and found to operate injuriously: and how is a repeal to be accomplished, if those who see and feel this injurious operation were not at liberty to point out the defects and mischievous tendency of such provisions, and to suggest a remedy? Besides, where is the man of any party who does not act, yes, really act upon this principle? Again; there is no man who can hold an opinion which he believes to be wrong. He must believe it to be right; and believing it to be right, he must believe it to be useful; and be-

believing it to be right and useful, it becomes his duty to propagate and maintain it. And can it possibly be right, that a man should be punished or punishable for doing that which he conscientiously feels it to be his duty to do? Can any man feel it right or desire to be punished for the maintenance of an opinion, the establishment of which he thinks would be beneficial to himself and to society at large? Impossible. And how, then, can he feel it right to punish or persecute any other person who may be acting under a similar influence—with the same views and from the same motives? And is it in the nineteenth century that these questions require to be asked?

It would be easy to shew that opinions, merely as such, never can prove injurious to any society or government legitimately constituted: that numbers cannot alter the nature of things; that majorities cannot make black white, or white black; and that as to matters of opinion purely, they have no right to interfere at all. But I have not leisure to enlarge upon the subject much more at present. The great mistake seems to be committed by those who are called our legislators not well understanding the science of legislation. They are a great deal too officious. Instead of confining their attention to matters of *general concernment*, they are frequently nibbling at those rights which individuals do not surrender when entering into society, and with which even society itself has no right to intermeddle. A legislature for instance, would have as much right to say whether I shall have tea or coffee to my breakfast,—whether I shall wear woollen or cotton hose, as it has to say how I shall worship my Creator, or what I shall or shall not believe. In short if a Jury or a legislature do not think as I do upon any given subject, we should agree to differ. These gentlemen, claim and exercise the right of thinking individually for themselves; and surely they cannot think it right to punish or to censure me for exercising the same privilege. Would this be doing by me as they would wish to be done unto? In fact, I know of no opinion, excepting one which can be deemed seditious; and even this, supposing a Government to be fairly and legitimately constituted, I think we might safely treat with silence and contempt. When a nation is fairly and fully called upon to exercise its sovereignty in the formation of a government and when the general will has been fairly and fully ascertained upon the important subject, I should hold it to be very culpable for any individual to assert that such general will ought not to decide, or ought not to meet *practically with universal support*. There can be no society or association for any purpose where the *few* will not consent to be governed by the *many* in all matters of general concernment. Yet, while I thus claim the practical support of every individual in all *measures* of general concernment and which have been previously determined upon by the general will, I still hold every individual to be at liberty to urge any argument or opinion which he may think it necessary to bring forward in opposition to any

measure which he shall disapprove of, as injurious or improper. But I must here conclude.

Most sincerely wishing you a glorious victory upon your approaching trial, and a safe deliverance from those hypocritical scoundrels ycleped the "Vice Society."

I remain, dear Sir,
Ashton-under-line, near Manchester, Your sincere friend,

October 3, 1849. JAMES OGDEN, Surgeon

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

I SHOULD not have troubled you at this period, did I not conceive that a few observations in answer to Mr. Cousins, are called for from me. Now I beg to put this question, to every reader of this letter, to which he alludes, *Do you consider that the meaning of the words, "those blessings which nature intended equally for all her sons?" conveys the slightest allusion to landed, or any other property?* I am convinced that without torture, they only carry with them an idea of universal, civil, and religious liberty; and the free enjoyment of the produce of labour, exempt from the claims of a corrupt government, and a national clergy. This I can assure Mr. C. and all your readers, was my meaning; and I wish other men, would like him honestly come forward, and call for explanation whenever any thing like ambiguity appears in the conduct, or statements of the reformers. That seems to me the best method by which our views and intentions may be better known: for as the more able friends to reform, from certain causes are deterred from becoming the more prominent in the cause, it is left to those who with honest and pure motives, are nevertheless less capable perhaps, of expounding and proposing their sentiments. I am inclined to think, that Mr. C. is a person of landed property, and I am sure we shall hail his accession to our cause, with great satisfaction; and pledge ourselves that private property, under all circumstances, must be held sacred in "that spirit of universal justice, which we boast as our anchor." I hope, and trust, that Mr. C., myself, and all we Reformers, have the same end in view; and the method he has chosen of promoting unanimity, is the only one calculated to succeed, and bring us to the possession of our object, "Political and Religious Equality."

Justice is what the Reformers want. Justice is what they are entitled to, and Justice they will have, for when men are acquainted with their natural rights, when they see that we are all subject to the same passions; it is morally impossible, that they can suffer a power, founded only on fraud, and injustice, to usurp their best blessings, and deprive them of what is peculiarly their own.

"The fever throbbing in the tyrant's veins

In quick strong language, tells the daring wretch he is

That he is mortal, like the poorest slave

Who wears his chain,"

I have already endeavoured to shew the injustice, mischief, and danger, necessarily attendant on church government, and hereditary privilege; and I feel certain that reform in our representation will alone remove their evils. All our grievances may be traced to the want of that reform. The want of reform, to the progress of abuse, and the progress of abuse, to some defect in our constitution in not preventing it. Here then is the matter brought to issue, and it only remains to decide in what part this defect lies. It must be certain it cannot rest with the People themselves, for they have at no period since the conquest, and introduction of feudal law, had their full share in the legislature of their country. They have only partially succeeded, in the attempts made by them, from that period down to the revolution of 1688, to regain the freedom of their Saxon ancestors. Perhaps at the time of the revolution, the three branches of our constitution, had more nearly equalized their moral and physical power, than at any former period, but since that, the knowledge of the People has so rapidly advanced, and its progress has been so great, as would have left the best monarchical government, that could possibly exist, far, very far behind. Instead of considering how to remedy this *evil*, by an advance as nearly equal on their own parts, they impolitically have been attempting to oppose and suppress, all efforts to enlighten the People. But all their efforts have been vain. Knowledge has triumphantly overcome all the obstacles that despotism could interpose; and has now reached an eminence, that affords a clear prospect of the intricate maze from which the People have begun to emerge, and displays to their minds, the land of milk and honey, so long the object of their hopes. The disseminating rays of literature, have at length penetrated the dark recesses of obscurity, and cast its flame of elucidation, on the errors of former times.

The framers of our constitution, saw that as all the physical or *real* power was on the part of the People, it would only be possible to balance it by conferring a corresponding weight of moral or *fictional* power on the other branches. It was necessary that a very particular respect should be impressed on the minds of the People, with regard to the moral power, with which the executive and lords, were invested; and to have continued the three powers in the equal balance in which they thus appeared, it would have been necessary that the People should be continually kept in that ignorance, in which they then were: for if once by the light afforded by general knowledge, they could discover through the flimsy veil, in which these *moral rights* were wrapped, the discovery would necessarily prove fatal to the existence of those rights. Information did, however, spread rapidly, in spite of the *indirect* efforts by governments to prevent it. And to meet the power which knowledge thus

gave the People, the successive governments of this country, have so progressively encroached on our constitution, (that very constitution on which they depend, and which gave them existence) as to leave but little of it to us.

The period seems now to have arrived, when we shall sink into a military despotism, or rise to liberty immortal. If the former, our evils will, like a body of combustibles, be only more compressed, to take a wider range when they do explode. The moment will come, when grievances will be redressed by force; and utter destruction will be the probable consequence of withholding our rights from us. Every thing that then presents abuse, or needs reform, will meet *ample* attention. If we have now ceased to be politically free, a nation accustomed to freedom, must soon prove that a general sense of oppression, is not to be dissipated by force. The embers of former liberty, though shaded by tyranny, will shed a horrid glare on the enormities of that tyranny, and at some seasonable opportunity, impulsively burst forth, with all its consequent terrors. When Britons are thus driven to extremes, they may perhaps perceive that *some* of their institutions, are incapable of keeping pace with the wisdom of the People. They have long shewn themselves too slow, conscious perhaps, that every step weakens their moral power. These institutions may probably fall on the same principle, that destroyed the feudal system: and a government may yet be established, which being a government of the People, and the People only, will ever advance with them, unclogged with the prejudices of former times.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. A. PARRY.

Speldhurst Street.

WINDSOR POLITICS.

Lines composed on the occasion of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent being seen standing betwixt the coffins of Henry VIII., and Charles I., in the Royal Vault at Windsor.

Famed for contemptuous breach of sacred ties,
By headless Charles, see heartless Henry lies :
Between them stands another scepter'd *thing*,
It moves,—it reigns,—in all but name—a King :
Charles to his People—Henry to his wife,
In him the double tyrant starts to life ;
Justice and death have mixed their dust in vain,
The royal vampires start to breathe again ;
How shall we trust to tombs ? Since these disgorge
The blood and dust of both—to mould a George.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.